

2161
PATENT

Customer No. 22,852

Attorney Docket No. 6556.0003-04

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE #12 CW
9-25-02

In re Application of:)

John POLK)

) Group Art Unit: 2161

Application No.: 09/975,241)

) Examiner: Edward Cosimano

Filed: October 12, 2001)

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS
FOR CHILD PAYMENT
PROCESSING AND CHILD
SUPPORT DISBURSEMENT
PROCESSING BY A
PROCESSING ENTITY)Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

RECEIVED
SEP 25 2002
GROUP 3600TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Enclosed is a Notice of Related Litigation and an Information Disclosure Statement. A fee of \$180.00 to cover the Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Dated: September 20, 2002

By: Robert E. Converse, Jr.
Robert E. Converse, Jr.
Reg. No. 27.432FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com



RECEIVED
SEP 25 2002
GROUP 3600

September 30, 1997, matured into the '669 patent. Divisional application no. 09/003,941 ("the '941 application"), filed January 7, 1998, resulted from the '187 application and matured into the '107 patent. Application no. 09/413,862 ("the '862 application"), filed October 7, 1999, is a continuation from the '941 application. The instant application is a continuation of the '862 application.

In this dispute, the plaintiff has alleged inter alia, albeit without support, that the '107 and the '669 patents are invalid under § 102(a) and (b), although it is not clear from the Complaint what particular art the plaintiff relies upon. Further, the plaintiff alleges, without support, that the '107 and the '669 patents are invalid under § 102(f) "as the transfer of Child Support Payments Nationally would not have been possible without the creation of the Child Support Application Banking Convention developed with Federal Funds and adopted by the National Automated Clearing House Association and DISA." The plaintiff also alleges, without support, that the '107 and the '669 patents are invalid under § 102(g) because "the claims of the patent were already in use in this country by others, including multiple state agencies."

The plaintiff further alleges, without support, that the invention is not unique and is obvious to all skilled in the art. However, the Complaint does not specifically identify any basis for this allegation.

Finally, the Complaint alleges, again without support, that the '107 and the '669 patents are unenforceable due to inequitable conduct due to an intentional failure to disclose pertinent information to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office during prosecution of the '941 and '187 applications, as well as a bald complaint of patent misuse. The allegedly pertinent information, which defendant (and counter-plaintiff) was

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

allegedly aware of and did not disclose, is being submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement filed concurrently with this Notice of Related Litigation.

In the counterclaim, defendant/counter-plaintiff alleges, among other causes of action, willful infringement of the '669 patent and willful infringement of the '107 patent by plaintiff/counter-defendant. Notably, the plaintiff/counter-defendant admits infringement in the Complaint.


Applicant will continue to keep the PTO informed of further developments in this related litigation.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Notice, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 20, 2002

By: 
Robert E. Converse, Jr.
Reg. No. 27,432

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com